
From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
Sent: 04 September 2023 21:55
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Categories:

Application Reference No. : HPK/2023/0293 Site Address: 16B Broad Walk Buxton Derbyshire SK17 6JR Buxton
Comments by: David Pendery

From:

23
Orchard Road
Hook Norton
Banbury
Oxfordshire
OX15 5LX

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Neither

Comments: Statement of Significance and Impact Assessment

The tone of the text is dismissive of the extent of the listings for no16 & no17, whereas older listings are generally quite short and not very descriptive. However, the point is that whatever the applicant and agent consider the merits of the boundary wall and coal stores/sheds of both no16 & no17, they are both curtilage listed and as such are as legally protected as the main buildings.

The text plays down the value of the pair of coal stores/sheds and the boundary walls as less significant than the main buildings and in terms of architectural merit they perhaps are less significant. However, the pair of coal stores/sheds and boundary walls to no16 & no17 have historical value, evidential value and some aesthetic value, all as defined by Historic England (Conservation Principles, Policies & Guidance, 2008). They are probably unique survivors along Hartington Road, contributing towards the record of the domestic arrangements for the grand houses facing onto The Broadwalk.

The pair of coal stores/sheds may not have the same significance as the main buildings, but the applicant and agent have not demonstrated the public benefit that outweighs the harm of demolishing the coal store/shed and most of the boundary wall to no16. Consequently, before the application is approved, this ought to be demonstrated to an appropriate degree, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, paras 194-208.

Drawings

The existing and proposed elevations from Hartington Road are incomplete, as they do not show the existing pair of coal stores/sheds, which they ought to.

The Proposed site plan does not show all of the critical dimensions, which it ought to, as there is no dimension for the width between the boundary for no17 and the rear side wall of no16. As measured on site, this dimension measures at approximately 4800mm (+/- a few millimetres). The minimum recommended width for a car parking space is 2400mm, so the space is just wide enough to park two cars. However, there is then no width for footpath access to no16 if both southern car parking spaces are occupied. Consequently, it is assumed that the planning case officer will be seeking the comments of the building control officer about this.

DCC Highways Comments

It is surprising that DCC Highways have decided not make any comments on this application. Firstly, whilst it is recognised that there are mature trees all along the edge of the pavement of Hartington Road, the large tree immediately to the north of the northern proposed single parking space will substantially block the visibility splay for the parking space adjacent and will be within the visibility splay for the proposed southern two parking spaces. One line of thought could be that the restricted view would generate cautious driving from a driver coming out of the northern parking space but the tree will also block the view of someone driving along Hartington Road from the north, who might not see a car emerging from that car parking space.

Secondly, for the southern two parking spaces, the visibility splay should be measured from before the cars start to cross the public footpath and there is also national guidance on this. As shown on the proposed plan, the northern of the two parking spaces possibly has sufficient sideways visibility towards the south and the southern parking space possibly has sufficient sideways visibility towards the north but neither parking space appears to have sufficient sideways visibility in the other direction. This is further compounded by the height of the existing boundary walls of between 1.0m and 1.1m high. The guidance for the vertical height of visibility is only 0.6m. so the retained boundary walls will further restrict the visibility along the pavement. Consequently, taking the narrowness of the two parking spaces and the restricted visibility together, the two parking spaces might be better suited as a single parking space.

In Conclusion

Bearing in mind the above comments, I consider that the application documents ought to be reviewed and a more robust case made before the application is determined.

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>
